

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231*JH*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/602,162 06/22/00 TRAMMELL

H M-9210 US

024251 PM82/1101
SKJERVEN MORRILL MACPHERSON LLP
25 METRO DRIVE
SUITE 700
SAN JOSE CA 95110

EXAMINER

BLANKENSHTP, G

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3612

DATE MAILED:

5

11/01/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/602,162	Applicant(s) Trammel et al.
	Examiner Greg Blankenship	Group Art Unit 3612

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Greg Blankenship

(3) _____

(2) Ted Lopez

(4) _____

Date of Interview Oct 31, 2001

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy is given to 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1-24

Identification of prior art discussed:

No. _____

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

A discussion on the outstanding election of species requirement was had. It was determined that the election of species requirement was made in error and that no response to it was necessary. The error was that although there are two distinct hoist assemblies shown, they both operate the same way. Since the claims are directed to a method and the hoist assemblies operate the in the same manner, there is no distinction between the inventions, the method. Therefore, the election requirement has been removed.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

GREGORY BLANKENSHIP
PATENT EXAMINER


Au 3612

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.